





# WILL YE ALSO GO AWAY?

A SERMON,

PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,

ON THE

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER THE EPIPHANY, 1867.

BY THE

REV. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, AND CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH.

PUBLISHED BY REQUEST.

SOLD BY JAMES PARKER & CO., OXFORD,

AND 377, STRAND, LONDON;

AND RIVINGTONS,

LONDON, OXFORD, AND CAMBRIDGE.

1867.

WILLIAM HENRY HARRIS

1847

WILLIAM HENRY HARRIS

WILLIAM HENRY HARRIS

WILLIAM HENRY HARRIS

WILLIAM HENRY HARRIS

WILLIAM HENRY HARRIS

WILLIAM HENRY HARRIS

## PREFACE.

THE publication of the sermon, which Dr. Heurtley preached on the Sunday previous to the delivery of my own, makes it necessary to say that my sermon was composed without any reference to his. I have simply, as my subject suggested, stated incidentally that doctrine of the Holy Eucharist which I believe as matter of faith, which (without any idea of controversy) I preached in a practical sermon<sup>1</sup> which was condemned extrajudicially in 1843-4. I restated it summarily in the opening of the first which I preached after my suspension, in 1846; vindicated it more systematically in that of 1853<sup>2</sup>, and supported more fully in two volumes, as being the doc-

<sup>1</sup> "The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent."

<sup>2</sup> "The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist."



trine of the Catholic Church from the first<sup>3</sup>, and of our own<sup>4</sup>.

Having, in these places, stated at large my grounds for my faith, it is the less necessary to enter into any painful controversy with one with whom I hoped to have been united in the resistance to the pressing tide of unbelief.

My own strong conviction is, that the issue of that battle in the English Church will depend very mainly on the issue of that which is now waged against what is called "sacerdotalism." People attach doubtless different meanings to the word; but what is really included in its rejection, is the belief of any medium between the soul and God. It involves, primarily, the rejection of Sacraments, and, therein, of any absolving power committed to the priesthood; and, secondarily, any authority in matters of faith, other than the conscience of each individual, recognizing as true in Holy Scripture

<sup>3</sup> "The Doctrine of the Real Presence, as contained in the Fathers, from the Death of S. John the Evangelist to the 4th General Council, A.D. 451." 1855.

<sup>4</sup> "The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Doctrine of the English Church, with a vindication of the reception by the wicked, and of the Adoration of our Lord Jesus Christ, truly present." 1857.

what commends itself to its individual judgment. In the abstract, this claim of absolute freedom within revelation might coincide with an absolute submission to revelation itself. And doubtless, in pious, although, so far, not humble minds, they may coexist. But they can do so no longer than the human mind can believe that it has within it an infallible interpreter, the infallible guidance of God the Holy Ghost given to itself upon prayer. But then, since persons come to opposite conclusions upon matters of faith, this would involve the claim, in either party, to an exclusive possession of that gift,—which humility forbids. Yet a fallible interpretation of an infallible revelation, in things which pertain to the essence of the revelation, i. e. matters of faith, were a contradiction—it would be to make the revelation at once practically fallible and infallible. Moreover, since the ground of this acceptance of some truths and the rejection of others in the infallible revelation is a disposition or indisposition of the human mind towards them, the mind which so acts, does, in fact, unconsciously but really judge *à priori* upon the Divine revelation, and becomes itself the arbiter of what is or is not Divine. When the human mind has got thus far, separating

off what it calls "the human element" in Holy Scripture from the Divine, it cannot fail soon to discover that it has no test, out of itself, to distinguish what it still reputes Divine from what it counts to be human; that there is nothing (to use a convenient term) objectively Divine; and that if the Divine portion is that which appears to each to be Divine, and different portions appear to be so to different minds, then the so-called Divine portion also must be really human, i. e., what enlightened human reason sees to be true; and revelation will be reduced to something much less than *we* believe to be the ordinary operation of grace. Belief in our Lord's Divinity must in such case disappear too; for God could not reveal what was merely human, nor could words of God the Word have a mere human element.

The attack has been dexterously begun. "Sacerdotalism" suggests the idea of human weakness and arbitrariness. People are taught to think that men put the Sacraments in the place of Christ. They appeal to men's love for our Divine Redeemer, and forget that the self-same argument may be turned against the mediation of our Lord Himself, as coming between the soul and God. This has been before now—in our own times.



It is then with deep sorrow, that I see that many of the Evangelical party have already forgotten the lessons of 1845, and having, for a short time, perceived that unbelief is the real enemy, whom, in these last days, we have to meet with united hearts and minds, are already drawn off to a civil war with others who believe in and love the same, their Redeeming Lord.

But, however they may, in a mistaken zeal, attack us, we have this advantage at least, that we need not attack them. We have but to teach positive truth. I have felt it necessary to speak distinctly and earnestly the truth which I hold, and although, as I have said, that enunciation of truth was independent of the censure of Dr. Heurtley, who probably had others, rather than myself, in his mind<sup>5</sup>, yet it

<sup>5</sup> Dr. Heurtley charges with dishonest use of the notice of the Homily "On the due receiving of Christ's blessed Body and Blood under the form of bread and wine," those who cite these words as attesting the belief of the real objective Presence. He applies to this the saying, "In fraudem legis facit, qui, salvis verbis legis, sententiam legis *circumvenit*," p. 31. I have myself adduced the evidence for taking them in this their literal meaning, with great fulness. ("The Real Presence," &c., pp. 4—160.) Yet I am sure that Dr. Heurtley never could have brought that charge against myself. It is strange that I had before to vindicate the meaning of the words against the

was called forth by the same circumstances which on the opposite side elicited his. The more this popular attack upon ritual is carried on, *because* it expresses truths which we believe, the more necessary it is for us who hold those truths, to teach them lovingly, fervently, gratefully, distinctly; guarding our language, that it seem not to convey any gross or carnal notions, such as the Bishops seem to have thought to be associated in our minds with the belief in the real Objective Presence. Earnest, clear dogmatic teaching repeated, if need be, again and again, not controversy, still less (what some have used) contempt of those who have somehow failed to learn the truths, of which God has bestowed the knowledge upon us unworthy, will, by God's grace, win others to His truth.

I am then thankful that both in regard to the controversy which Dr. Heurtley's loving gentle spirit must have been so pained to feel compelled to revive in this place, and also in regard to the republication of the sermon, which the then Dr. Jeune preached in 1846, in refutation of what I had taught in mine,

opposite charge of Dean Goode, that I knowingly quoted words, which expressed Transubstantiation. ("The Nature of Christ's Presence," by Rev. W. Goode, p. 41.)

“The Entire Absolution of the Penitent,” my own task of controversy is over.

Dr. Jeune’s sermon occasioned the defence which formed the introduction to my second sermon on Absolution <sup>6</sup>, although, from unwillingness to enter into controversy with one then in authority in this place, I did not name him in my notes on my sermon, or quote his words. I have had occasion, since, to defend that belief; and to those defences I may refer any who wishes to know what I believe to have been the mind of the Church of England, without further controversy.

One word more to those who would seek to alter the basis of the Church of England. Protestantism never did withstand the inroads of unbelief. It may exist in individuals by aid of personal faith; if that personal faith is weakened or perplexed, it has nothing to fall back upon. The Church of England has stood hitherto, although England had a melancholy pre-eminence in its deistical writers; it stood, I believe, because it is not Protestant, but Catholic. Innovation is rife and nearer now than in 1841. At that time, here at least, there was no one who

<sup>6</sup> “Entire Absolution of the Penitent.” Sermon 2. 1846.

did not believe that he believed. Unbelief was held in check or converted. A mind, presaging the coming evil, said of this place: "The Heads of Houses may crush Tractarianism; they will then have to do with Germanism." And how is it now? If, untaught by that experience, men weaken those who maintain the Catholic teaching of our Church, the formularies themselves will not long stand, nor the Protestantized Church of England—which God forbid.



A

## SERMON,

*&c.*

S. JOHN vi. 67—69.

“Then said Jesus unto the twelve, Will ye also go away? Then Simon Peter answered Him, Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life; and we believe and are sure [know] that Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.”

FEW, simple, earnest, loyal words! Yet they comprise the whole relation of the creature to the Creator, the needs of the creature, the all-sufficingness of the Creator, as revealed in Jesus. Our Lord's discourse had had that sifting character, which Divine truth ever has, when brought in contact with our wills. Two frames of mind there have ever been, from Cain's self-willed unbidden sacrifice, over against Abel's sacrifice of faith, two there are and ever will be, while this our trial-state shall endure; the one offers unto God and accepts from Him what itself wills, the other offers to God and accepts from Him what He wills.



As is its choice herein, such is the whole man. The one, amid seeming service and real reserve, takes itself for its supreme end. It arraigns the Infinite before the finite; measures the Infinite by the finite; rejects of the Infinite what it cannot compress within the measures of the finite. Faith knows that, not here only but in all eternity, while its positive knowledge shall be enlarged endlessly by the ever self-revealing God, it shall not in the very least approximate to the compass of the Infinite; that, transfigured, illumined, engodded as it shall be, loosed, as it shall be, from the gyves and trammels of our mortality, free to gaze as it wills, God-enabled to behold the unveiled God in that beatific vision, it shall be a creature still; and the limitation of its condition shall be the assurance of its endless fruition. It shall never be sated, for it can never approach nearer to the unlimited compass of His Perfections, than at the outset. It will ever receive something new of His goodness, wisdom, love; for the finite cannot exhaust the Infinite. How then should it essay to measure here, the shoreless, fathomless ocean of His wisdom and His love, of which it knows nothing certainly, save what He has disclosed to it, according to the narrowness of its capacity to contain the Infinite. We stand like children at the brink of that viewless ocean. Strain our sight as we may, it reaches but a little way. We can see the most of it by watching those who, almost out of our sight, have been borne furthest

into it, to the very bounds of our horizon. Is this all? asks the child in its simple wondering; this is all, says the self-wise critic, who would grasp the Infinite in the hollow of his hand, and by created thought estimate the Creator.

So had the Jews done. They had stumbled at that unceasing stumbling-block to man's pride, the humility of God. They were prepared to greet a Messiah, who, as in Daniel's vision, should come in the clouds of heaven. They could not imagine that He Who came among them in human form was Almighty God: He, Whose father and mother they knew; He, the son of Joseph, as they deemed; He, to be the bread which cometh down from heaven! Our Lord met their murmurings, not by compromise, but partly by telling them that through mere human understanding they could not know Him. No man, unless swayed and enlightened from Heaven, could appreciate Him Who came from Heaven. Earth can estimate the things of earth, the heavenly could be discerned only by the heavenly. "Murmur not among yourselves. No man can come unto Me, except the Father, which hath sent Me, draw him." Then, having warned them, that, of themselves, they could not understand Him, He hinted to them the mystery of the vicarious redemption which He would work, of the life which He would give; "The bread which I will give is My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." Again they strive, "How can this Man give us His flesh to eat?" He does

not explain; but again He deepens His teaching, and tells them, in terms explicit although as yet unexplained, of that fulness of life and closeness of union with Himself which He would give to His own. He tells them how this life should be derived from the Source of life, the Father; that He had life inherent in Himself, although derived from the Father; that without Him there was no life; that by Him and by communion of Him, there was life eternal for those who received Him; that His flesh was life-giving, because He Himself had life; and that this endless life passed over to us, through our eating His flesh and drinking His blood—words which have their adequate fulfilment in the mysteries of the Holy Eucharist, as the Church of old ever understood it, and our own also. Again, many, heretofore His disciples, murmured, and He led their thoughts to that great future witness to His Godhead, His Ascension into Heaven, where He had been before. He does not contradict Himself, as if He said, “*My flesh profiteth nothing.*” Then would the Incarnation (God forbid) profit nothing. He again hints at the truth of His Deity. Mere flesh profits nothing; but united with the life-giving Deity, it is life-giving. “*The Spirit quickeneth.*” The life-giving Spirit, or Deity, which is life, made that sacred flesh wherewith it was united life-giving. “*The words which I speak unto you,*” those same words whereat the Jews had stumbled, and which Peter owned as “*words of eternal life,*” i. e. the



truths which those words conveyed, they are Spirit and are life, life from the Source of life.

Again, He renewed His warning that no one could, of mere nature, come to Him, without the drawing of the Father. Then followed the severance. Many went away, no more to return to Him during His visible presence on earth, they "walked no more with Him." Some, it may be, repented after His Resurrection; some parted with Him for ever, and with their own salvation. Then followed the appeal to the twelve, "Will ye also go away?" All had not gone who believed not; for Judas was still there. Jesus set them free; they needed Him, not (as human teachers) He them. He sets them free, that they might gain by their free choice of Him. Peter's fervent answer for all (as he thought) expresses at once their need, and that they had found whom their soul needed. "Lord, to whom shall we go?" Genuine voice of human nature from its depths, which none, save they who have felt their soul's needs, would echo now! For they imply the truth, that man of himself is insufficient for himself. "To *whom* shall we go?" To some one, then, S. Peter felt and knew that man must go. The nobler, the truer to itself, the Diviner, man's reason is, the more conscious it is of its own perfectibility, the more it knows that it needs some one to perfect it. Grand, even in its decay, is the reason of man; the reflection and created image of the Divine intelligence. Grand is it, because "the

light of eternal Reason," i. e. of God, "in which all unchangeable truths are seen, is present to it, as far as it can contain it<sup>1</sup>." Being uncreated, those truths exist in God ; to us they can come from Him alone in Whom they are ; God communicates them to the soul, the soul receives them from God. The eternal Word is "the true Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." Grand then is human reason, because, in the words of an eloquent writer, "All absolute and necessary truths, all the laws which constitute the order and beauty of the world, govern reason, bind the conscience, sustain science and art, all these truths, all these laws are manifestations of God, and reveal to us some of His thoughts, some of His will. All the truths which we possess, all which we can acquire, make us to see God in a certain way, and each progress of the mind in the order of truth, in the order of science, is an ascension towards God. Magnificent association of our minds with God ; glorious participation of Divine truth ! And we, like the blind plant, which, unknowing, draws from the bosom of the earth the juices which nourish it, we live on God and know it not ! As our bodies are bathed in the light of the sun, our spirits are inundated, penetrated by the light Divine. God supplies us all the truths we know, and presides truly over our intelligence. If we are capable of knowing ourselves, the world, and its Author, we owe it to the light Divine. God, then,

<sup>1</sup> S. Augustine.



is in all our thoughts, in all our judgments ; there is always a side of the soul turned towards Him, illumined by His light. If this great truth were ever present to us, reason and its authority would assume in our eyes a sacred character ; all sciences would have for us a religious interest ; we should thirst for their progress, as an advance of the knowledge of God. Our intellectual life would be a continual act of adoration and of love<sup>2</sup>."

What then is lacking, that human reason should not be self-sufficing ? Our own hearts, our conscience tell us. Knowledge, not even the knowledge of God, can never be the whole of man. For man is formed in the image of God, and "God is love." St. Paul then declared, not only the righteous judgment of God ; it was the voice of our inmost, truest nature, when he said : "Though I understand all mystery and all knowledge, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing<sup>3</sup>." Even then, if our will did not influence our reason amiss ; even if we could, by our natural powers, attain a knowledge, clear, complete, as far as its province extends, without error, without doubt, the brightness of our light would only make more visible the darkness of our moral misery. Our intellect is not ourself ; it is but an instrument of ourself. We may, in its conquests, or in its advances around us, forget ourselves. Let us go, but for ever so short a time,

<sup>2</sup> Maret, "Philosophie et Religion," p. 251.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Cor. xiii. 2.

into ourselves; let us give one stedfast gaze into ourselves, and we shall see more keenly than any, save God, could tell us, that all which a man *has*, yea, the highest intellect itself, is only an accident of what man *is*. Given the most glowing imagination, the most intuitive mathematical intellect, the most creative genius, the richest eloquence, the acutest analysis, the most marvellously combining synthesis, the most penetrating perception, all of these, in their most exalted degrees, are not man; they do not constitute the man. The wisdom of Solomon, still proverbial throughout the East, was no more himself than the personal beauty of Absalom, or the giant strength of Samson, or the valour of Jehu. The *will* of man, endowed with a freedom, the created likeness of God's All-wise will, and what man has, by the unceasing repetition of its choices, good or bad, become; that inward self, bared of every thing but itself; that self, which puts itself forth in all that multiplicity of acts even of the intellect; that self, which can be scanned only by the Omniscient, Who knows what He made, *that* alone is man. And is *that* self-sufficing? If thou hast, of thyself, power over thyself, if thou canst and dost ever choose *that* which, in thy most enlightened moments, when thou art, in thy created littleness, most like God, thou approvest as purely, simply, sovereignly best, then, unless thy inmost being were enveloped in one thick, impenetrable mist of self-deceit, thou wert self-sufficing. But

since we know that the truth is the very opposite of all this, that the good we would, we do not, that the evil which we would not, that we do ; then all within us, all the wondrousness of those Divine lineaments in our soul, which tempt us to make idols of ourselves or of our like, and which has occasioned the last philosophy, by an idolatry worse than fetichism (since the idol of fetichism was a power out of itself), to make man his own god,—“*homo homini, homo sibi Deus* ;”—our predestined greatness, of which we have the germs and witness in ourselves, and our moral feebleness and failure, our inherent greatness as well as our moral weakness, cries out aloud for a Deliverer ; it calls for a strength, a grace, a might not its own. “Who shall deliver me from the body of this death ?” What ? Should all around us in God’s creation fulfil perfectly the end for which He called it into being, the stars in their magnificent courses, or the insect in the minute and delicate perfection of its beauty ; should all glorify God, in that it is what it is, and *that* being alone be a failure, which He has set as His vicegerent over this lower world, which He has made in His own image and likeness, to which He has given the power to know Himself and some portion of His divine perfections, freely to conform ourselves to them, freely to adore Him !

Yet this is but the threshold of the love and goodness of our God. It were the adequate felicity of a rational creature to know God, as He can be

known by reason, His Unity, His Spirituality, His Attributes, and to be conformed to Him by imitating Him. But God from the first designed more for us. Even in Paradise began that supernatural order, when God conversed with Adam as a friend. And when the Fall broke in upon our natural relations to God, and weakened our wills, God shed on its decay the hope of the restoration, beyond what belonged to us, as the rational creatures of His hand. You know how Prophet and Psalmist deepened this, how God accustomed His people to the thought of beholding Himself in Human Form, how He taught them to long after this life, for the bliss of the beatific Vision, to behold Him in His Beauty with our own eyes after the temporary dissolution of our flesh, to behold His Countenance, and therein to see Him as He is; to thirst for God; to long for Him as our own God—and for the eternal pleasures at His right hand, which are no created things, but the blissful sight and possession of Himself. The fulness and definiteness and closeness of the relation belonged to the New Testament; that God would be all in all; that our likeness to God would be a fruit of our beholding Him as He is; that we should be “partakers of the Divine Nature.”

These aspirations, which, as relics of Paradise, remain as the mitigating spirit of the mystic Pantheism of the East, had been fostered in their perfectness in Israel. Peter knew that all which the prophets had taught was to be accomplished in



Jesus. Yet the form of his answer is not simply that of one who believed in Jesus. It is of one who needed Him. It is not like Elisha's protest of affection to his master, "as the Lord liveth, and as thy soul liveth, I will not leave thee." It expresses the soul's deep need of a Divine Master. "Lord, to whom shall we go?" To part with Jesus was to him to part with life. "Thou hast the words of eternal life; and we believe and know that Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God." S. Peter could have understood *then*, as little as the Jews who forsook Jesus, *how* our Blessed Lord would fulfil His saying. It was as little intelligible to S. Peter as to them: "How can this man give us His flesh to eat?" Jesus had not explained it, and, when explained, it remained still as inscrutable a mystery as before. Then, too, he had to receive on faith the truth itself: he learned, indeed, in the institution of the Holy Eucharist, where and when, and under what visible forms, He would give us His body to eat, His blood to drink; but how that Body which was to be broken, that Blood which was to be shed, should by anticipation be present under those visible forms, which our Great High Priest, antedating the violence of the Jews, consecrated by the words "This is My Body, this is My Blood," and so, (they are S. Gregory's words<sup>4</sup>) "according to the mode of His priestly act, ineffable and invisible to man,

<sup>4</sup> In Christi. Resurr., Orat. i. t. iii. p. 389. See the context in "The Doctrine of the Real Presence," p. 434.



offered Himself as an offering and sacrifice for us, Priest at once and the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world," this remained as much a mystery as before. But the Jews believed not, because they understood not: Peter believed the words of Jesus, although he understood them not, because he believed in Jesus. This is plainly the divergence-point between belief and unbelief in a Divine revelation. Yet these Jews were consistent. They prejudged indeed wrongly the question of our Lord's authority; but they saw rightly that it must be, "all or none." They would not receive all, and therefore they broke off with our Lord at once, and "walked no more with Him." They could not imagine themselves His disciples while they rejected one doctrine which He emphatically taught. They were wrong in rejecting their Redeemer and their God on *à priori* notions. They saw rightly that they could not be half-disciples, half-believing and half-rejecting what must be either wholly human or wholly Divine. It was not ignorance which repelled them. Ignorant prejudice readily melts before the sun of Divine truth. Not what they knew not, but the truth which gleamed through our Lord's words roused their rebellion. They stumbled at that unchanging stumbling-block, the humility of the Incarnation. It costs little to believe that our Lord was God in a mere seeming human form. It costs nothing to believe and admire Him as simply Man. Heresy did both by turns, and, by so doing, attested

that either belief was congenial to the natural man. But to believe that He was Very God and Very Man, that the Holy Child, Who was conceived in the womb, borne in the arms, nursed like other children, carried to and fro at others' will, was Almighty God, this is a depth of divine condescension which *they* only could believe who, as our Lord told them, were drawn from above by the Father Who sent Him.

This assertion of His Deity lay in our Blessed Lord's sayings. He spoke indeed of that side only of His Superhuman Being, which related to us and our salvation. He spoke of Himself as "the Bread of life which came down from Heaven." He speaks of Himself, as the personal Nourisher of the whole human race, not by a revelation of truth, not by amelioration of mankind ; not by any thing which He would found or teach or occasion, not even by the conversion of the world to His Father, but by Himself. "*I am the Bread of life.*" "*I am the Living Bread which came down from Heaven : if any man eat of this Bread, he shall live for ever. The Bread which I will give is My Flesh, which I will give for the life of 'the world.'*" He speaks of Himself personally, as holding all the spiritual lives of all in His keeping, "that of all whom He has given Me, I should lose none." He tells us, that He is the Quickener of the dead ; "*I will raise him up at the last day*"<sup>5</sup>. He tells us, again and again, that He,

<sup>5</sup> S. John vi. 44. 54.

by participation of Himself, imparteth life. "He that eateth Me shall live by Me." He speaks of that mutual interchange between Him and the soul, which can belong not to the highest created spiritual intelligence—"Indwelling." Devils have dwelled in the bodies of men. To dwell in the soul is the prerogative of God Alone. Yet our Lord speaks of that closest union of the creature with its God, as fulfilled in Him. "He that eateth My Flesh, and drinketh My Blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him."

The rejection by those, His disciples, was then a forerunner of His Crucifixion. "We have a law, and by our law He ought to die, because He made Himself the Son of God<sup>6</sup>." "Ye have heard His blasphemy." The Crucifixion of the Lord of Glory was, in those days, only the legitimate consequence and complement of that rejection of truth which they could not reconcile with their preconceived opinions. The "complement," what was it, alas, but the filling up of their iniquities?

And yet that Crucifixion is continually, morally, though unknowingly, renewed now. Jesus is either God, or the Jews, according to their law, were right in condemning Him. He spoke the truth; He was the Truth, or they would have rightly said, "For a good work we stone Thee not; but for blasphemy; and because Thou, being a man, makest Thyself God." And, but for those sins of ours and

<sup>6</sup> S. John xix. 27.



for God's displeasure against sin, which He bore in those three dreary hours upon the Cross, which were the worse crime on man's part, the infliction of those three hours of bodily pain, or this continued ratifying of the blaspheming sentence by those for whom He died, by those who once were His, yet who, —although in His ineffable glory they can inflict no pain on His now Impassible Nature, still,—in denying that He is what He says He is, “crucify the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame?”

Yet, for you, my sons, they are not evil days, upon which your youth has fallen. The choice comes before you more nakedly. But the clearer the choice, so much, with God's grace, the easier. Many clouds have rolled away, many more are rolling away; half-faith and half-unbelief are disappearing; and the deadly antagonism is unveiling itself; “Is Jesus God, or is man a part of God?” “has he no God but himself, but humanity?” Deism, which Bossuet called “a disguised Atheism,” is disappearing in the increased consistency of the struggle. There remains only one consistent choice, the Catholic Faith, such as in our Creeds we profess, such as the Church ever believed, or Pantheism.

To you too our Lord still says the words, which He said to the twelve, “Will ye also go away?” We may “go away,” ye know, in faith or in life, denying our Lord in deeds or in words. In every intellectual choice, in which, upon any à

*priori* ground, you reject knowingly any truth proposed to you by our Lord in Holy Scripture, you enact again the part of those poor Jews, when they said, "This is a hard saying, who can hear it?" Whensoever, in prayer, in self-oblation, in heart, in will, in affection, you say to Jesus, "Lord, to whom should we go" beside Thee? you make that choice, through which the eleven, who made it truly, now reign in glory with Jesus in His kingdom.

"Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life." No one, who ever said that truly from the heart, went far from Him, their life.

We cannot analyze why His words are so attractive to us, why they speak to us as "man never spake." They read us; they transpierce us; they awe, they arraign, judge, condemn us; they wound, but it is to heal; they kill, but it is to give life; they enter into our souls; they lift up our souls with them; they transfigure us with light; they bear us up to God. They are sweeter than all sweetness; mighty in their sway with a Divine might. What should give them this varied power over all human souls, save that they are spirit and life, the words of Him Who knew what was in man, because He made him? Power they have "over all human souls," I said; save those which rebel against them. For Almighty God has limited His own Omnipotence to make room for the freedom of His creatures, freely to choose Himself. But then the words which appealed to us in vain will bear witness against us.



“The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day<sup>7</sup>.”

And if we can feel that His words are Divine, yet only through His Spirit can discern some portion of their fulness, much less can we (as some would) sound the depths of His human character, or span the compass of His Divine plan, which reacheth back to the time of Adam's fall, and onward to the blessed eternity of His redeemed, which “knits together in one the things in heaven and things in earth” under Him their Head, which comprises every infant born into this world, or the lowest and most degraded of our race, those whom man loathes or despises, and the highest created intelligence which has the nearest deepest insight into the perfections of God ; and, above them all, adored by all, has placed this human nature of ours, in Him ever all-holy, in Him Deified. The slightest outskirts of that plan, its surface, its outline, we can gaze on, because He has put us, like Moses, in the cleft of a rock, and covered us with His hand, so that we should see what man can behold in the flesh of His Divine glory. We can see that Divine wisdom alone could plan, and Divine knowledge alone could foresee, and Divine power alone could fulfil, what encompasses the whole range of human hearts, in all their varieties of endowments and the manifold combinations of His gifts, from the idiot or undeveloped savage, who still can love Him,

<sup>7</sup> S. John xii. 48.

or the peasant-faith which, in its apprehensive simplicity, can, by believing in Him, know Him, to the keenest intellect, whose ennobling wisdom it is to adore Him, and which transforms and knits in one that all-but Divine Majesty of our unfettered royal wills, which He Himself will not break, wherein He Himself will reign only, if willing, Whose service is perfect freedom, Whom to serve is to reign.

But criticize, estimate, weigh, appreciate, patronize, the Divine Wisdom of that plan ! Alas, poor human nature, when wilt thou learn that thy highest wisdom is to be sought above thee, not below thee ? that thou art ennobled, not by subjecting thy God to thee, but by being partaker of Him ? that thou dost subject thy Creator to thee, if thou criticizest aught of His revelation ? To question *à priori* any syllable of God's revelation is to deny the whole. It is to be ignorant of the first principles of the relation of the creature and the Creator ; it is to deny that one has a Creator. The poor Jews were consistent when they rejected our Lord wholly, when they blasphemed and crucified Him for claiming Divine power. They rejected His teaching, and therewith they rejected Himself. But it is strangely inconsistent to acknowledge Him as the Revealer of God in any truth which offers the least difficulty to our understanding (such as a life to come), and to disbelieve, *à priori*, any mystery, whether it be a hard saying to the intellect or the affections. Revelation, like this natural world and its laws, is one

whole, one supernatural system, as the other is natural. The key to the supernatural system is love, as that of the natural is intellect, One, All-wise and All-loving, guiding us in both. Love, and thou wilt find nothing hard. Love God, and thou wilt understand of Him all which can be understood in the flesh. Human nature, through its intrinsic nobility which God has given it, is ready to believe great things of itself. It is ready to believe the “*Divinæ particulam auræ.*” It shrinks not from believing that it is part of God, that it is something Divine, that it is all which there is of God. Well, then! Granted that there is a Living, Personal God every where in creation, yet not confounded with it, it cannot, *à priori*, reject that magnificent Scripture declaration, that we are “temples of the Holy Ghost.” And if it can believe that God dwells in us, not personally united with us, yet still indwelling us, it cannot, *à priori*, deny that, as Scripture says, “the whole fulness of the Godhead dwelt bodily in” Jesus, personally united with Him. And if we believe this, neither can we, *à priori*, deny (as Nestorius did) that the Holy Infant, when three months old, was also Very God. And if not this, then, neither, O my God, that “when Thou tookest upon Thee to deliver man, Thou didst not abhor the Virgin’s Womb.” And if not this, why should any mystery of the Holy Eucharist, at which those poor Jews stumbled because it implied that He was God, be a hard saying to us who believe and know that



He is God ? To me (if one may so speak) it seems a less mystery, that “<sup>8</sup> the Deity Unseen should His glory shroud ’neath these shadows mean,” than that He should personally take into Himself the likeness of our sinful flesh, our true flesh, in Him sinless. Inanimate nature could not sin; and sin is the single exception of rebellion of nature against God, the one dishonour of the Creator by His creature. To me it seems (so to speak) a less condescension to give to us “His Body and Blood under the form of bread and wine,” than for ever to unite to Himself this our poor human nature, in Him sinless, but in us so deep-dyed, stained, ingrained, degraded by sin. “Christ was the Word Who spake it.” What He spake, that we believe. “Lord, to whom should we go ?” How should we leave Him, our Life, the Truth, Who can neither deceive nor be deceived ?

But then, remember, my sons, that Jesus may be forsaken as wholly in life as in faith; nay, that all forsaking Him in life is a denial in faith too of Him Who died for you. He has said to those who call Him “Lord, Lord, and do not the things which He says,” that in that great day which shall decide eternity, He will say unto them, “I never knew you; depart from Me, ye workers of iniquity.” Never were they truly His, even while they seemed to be His, and had His Name on their lips, but not His commandments in their hearts. O, as you would not

\* Rhythm of S. Thomas Aquinas. See in “Paradise for the Christian Soul.” P. v. p. 123.



hear that terrible voice then, when there would be no hope, no future, except the loss of Him who is still your God, for ever, part not with Him now. There are coarse ways of parting with Him ; there are also what seem less coarse, because not committed with those who are coarse, and which would love less deeply, because they aid not to another's damnation. I do not say or think this of any of *you* ; and those who know not the sin which I mean, will not understand what I mean. If any here know, conscience will speak to him. Think not that I would reproach any one. I know how the sin is learned, one from the other, amid ignorance that it is sin. I have seen the terrible fascination of the sin upon its victims. I have seen the awful displeasure of God upon the sin. Although not in the coarse forms of which S. Paul speaks in that awful chapter to the Romans, it has the special malignity, that it is a violation of nature. And so God, of whose order of nature it is a violation, scourges it, follows it at first with lesser, then, unless forsaken, with deepening punishment. Yet what must the offensiveness of that sin be in God's sight, that He should take away the reason which He gave, so that the creature whom He made to glorify Him, should drag out a useless existence, a lunatic or an idiot ! - If you have ever seen either, you know how piteous a sight it is, how it makes the heart bleed to see reason dethroned, the victim of illusions, if imagination once was vivid, or of that drear blank

of idiotcy, when less gifted. Yet lunacy or idiotcy (lunacy not unseldom) have been the known fruit of that sin<sup>o</sup>, and early death. Yet I would not only scare any of you from sin by the judgments of God, although it is He, not I, which would scare you. Not I, who point to the thundercloud of His judgments over your head, scare you, but He who directs the lightning-shaft on whom He wills ; God scares from sin by His judgments ; He draws you by His secret grace and by His love. “ Will ye also to go away ? ” What has not Jesus done to win your love ? From Heaven, where He for ever intercedes for each one of us, He calls aloud to you, “ My son, the price of My blood, why crucifiest thou Me ? I have ever loved thee with all my Infinite love. No spot of My whole Body did I withhold from suffering for love of thee ; no anguish of My soul did I spare ; to no blasphemy did I close My ears ; no shame or indignity did I refuse for love of thee. And now, from thy birth what have I kept back from thee ? I withheld no gift of nature, which would not have destroyed the proportions in which I moulded thee, and would not have injured thee. I antedated reason in thee by grace, and, ere thou knewest thyself, I plunged thee in the ocean of My love, and made thee a member of Myself, and in Me, a son of God. Wherein have I since failed thee ? What didst thou ever ask Me, and I gave it thee not ? All I have

<sup>o</sup> I say this on medical authority.

has been thine for the asking. All has awaited thy pleasure. I have daily loaded thee with benefits, with drawings of My love. Not one good thought hast thou ever had, yea, though thou didst put it from thee, but it was I who inspired it. My Divine Heart has ever beat with love for thee. I have ever sought thy love, longed for thy love, drawn thee through every feeling of thy better self which I awakened in thee, to My love. I Myself am all thine. The joys which I have, at the right hand of the Father, are all thine. Thou hast oftentimes forgotten Me, but I have never forgotten thee. What have I done that thou wilt not have My love? My son, my son, why crucifiest thou Me? Why crucifiest thou Me, My son, My son?"

And what shall we say? What wilt thou say, son of Jesus? The past cannot cease to have been. The past, men say, cannot be recalled, cannot be undone. Yea, it *can* be undone, it *can* be recalled. Will; do as God teacheth thee, pour out thy soul in penitent confession before Him, and it *is* undone, it is recalled. Will; and Jesus blots it out with His own Blood. Will; and the book of thy misdeeds, blacker as they may be through our ingratitude, shall not have one blot recorded against thee. What wilt thou say then? Will you refuse such love? Thy whole life might be changed, if one like thyself answered thee, "I love thee." How then, when Jesus says to thee, "Thy Beloved is thine," wilt thou not answer, "and I am His?"

Lord, too late have I loved Thee, but give what Thou commandest, and command what Thou wilt. I am Thine, O save me ; save me, that I may never again so displease Thee. Keep me, that I may never again leave Thee. Others, besides Thee, have had dominion over me ; but henceforth, Thou, Thou Alone art my God ; Thou art my God and my Portion for ever. Leave me not, O God of my salvation ; and by Thy grace, Never, O never more will I abandon Thee."



## APPENDIX.

SOME words in the 'Reasons' preceding the resolution lately passed in the Upper House of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury (although *those reasons* were, on a division, rejected by the Lower House), compel me to state distinctly what I meant, when I spoke of the ritual, adopted in some churches, as "setting before the eyes" the truths which we, the older Tractarians, had taught. I said, in a meeting of the English Church Union, that this so-called Ritualist movement was eminently a lay movement. We, the Clergy, had taught the truth; the people had said, "Set it before our eyes." Although I have never taken any part in the ritualist movement, I believed and believe, that the object of that movement has been to set before the eyes Catholic truths in regard to the Holy Eucharist, which have been ever received in the Church. Whether it was wise or unwise to adopt this mode of teaching, it was too late to consider then. It had been adopted. In the congregations in which it has been received, devotion had evidently been promoted through it. Believing that it was attacked on the ground of truths which it exhibited, I defended it. When those are tolerated, who deny Hell and the truth of God's Word, it seemed little to ask, that *they* might be tolerated, whose only object it was, to set forth the faith as to the Holy Eucharist, as it has been received, "*semper, ubique et ab omnibus.*"

The above-mentioned reasons of the Upper House

of Convocation of the Southern Province carefully abstained from imputing any error of faith to the Ritualists. It carefully distinguished between *their* acts, and evils which (it was apprehended) might arise from those acts. Of the Ritualists themselves it did not speak. But it implied that there is danger lest "certain ritual observances" should "favour errors deliberately rejected by the Church of England."

Now I cannot for a moment believe that the Bishops, who passed this resolution, meant to condemn as "errors deliberately rejected by the Church of England," those truths which I spoke of as being "set before the eyes" by that ritual. But it becomes necessary for me, for my own position, and for that character of unreserve and straightforwardness which every one who would benefit the Church of England must maintain, to state what those doctrines are, which I believe to be included in it. These are;

1) That the Holy Eucharist is the great and central Act of Christian worship, our closest nearness to God.

2) That,—while repudiating any materialistic conceptions of the mode of the Presence of our Lord in the Holy Eucharist, such as I believe is condemned in the term "Corporal Presence of our Lord's natural Flesh and Blood," i. e. as though His Precious Body and Blood were present in any gross or carnal way, and not rather sacramentally, really, spiritually,—I believe, that in the Holy Eucharist, the Body and Blood of Christ are sacramentally, supernaturally, ineffably, but verily and indeed, present "under the form of bread and wine;" and that, "where His Body is, *there* is Christ'."

3) That,—thankfully believing that "the Offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, both original and actual;" and that our Blessed Lord Himself, having "finished upon the Cross that One Oblation of

<sup>1</sup> In Ps. cxix. Serm. viii. § 48, p. 1073. Ben.

Himself," doth now, while ever living to make intercession for us, add nothing to the Infinite Merits of the superabundant satisfaction of that His One Sacrifice which would suffice to redeem a thousand worlds;—I also believe, that, as in all our prayers "through Jesus Christ our Lord" we plead in word that one meritorious Sacrifice, so in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, the Priest presents and pleads to the Father that same Body which was broken for us, and the Blood which was shed for us, therein *sacramentally* present by virtue of the Consecration, which our Great High Priest, in His perpetual Intercession for us, locally present in His natural Body at the Right Hand of the Father, evermore exhibits before the Father for us. In the words of S. Ambrose, "<sup>2</sup> We have seen the High Priest coming to us; we have seen and heard Him, offering for us His Blood; we priests follow, as we can; that we may offer sacrifice for the people; although weak in deserts, yet honourable in sacrifice; since, though Christ is not now seen to offer, yet Himself is offered on earth, when the Body of Christ is offered; yea, Himself is plainly seen to offer in us, Whose Word sanctifieth the Sacrifice which is offered."

4) I do not know the "ritual observances" enough, to say whether the Adoration of Christ, truly present, is symbolized in them. But while I hold the literal meaning of the words of the Articles, "The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not, by Christ's Ordinance, reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped," I also hold, in the words of Bishop Andrewes, that "<sup>3</sup> Christ Himself, the Substance [res] of the Sacrament, in and with the Sacrament, out of and without the Sacrament, is, wherever He is, to be adored,—i. e. the Substance of the Sacrament but not the Sacrament, i. e. the earthly part, as Irenæus; the visible, as Augustine."

<sup>2</sup> In Ps. xxxviii. § 25, p. 852.

<sup>3</sup> Resp. ad Apol. Bell. p. 195.

These truths I hold, not as "opinions" but as matters of faith, for which, if need were, I would gladly "suffer the loss of all things."

These truths I would thankfully have to maintain, by the help of God, on such terms, that, if ("per impossibile," as I trust) it should be decided by a competent authority, that either the real Objective Presence, or the Eucharistic Sacrifice, or the worship of Christ there present (as I have above stated those doctrines) were contrary to the doctrine held by the Church of England, I would resign my office. Extra-judicial censures, or contradictions, or opinions, if directed against faith or truth, condemn none but their authors. Censures and criticisms of Bishops in 1841-45 have passed away, except in mournful effects upon individuals; the system which they criticized has lived, strengthened, rooted deeper through adversity.

VIGIL OF S. MATTHIAS, 1867.

THE END.









